

## COMMITTEE ON TRAFFIC/PUBLIC SAFETY

**November 21, 2005**

**5:30 PM**

Chairman Sysyn called the meeting to order.

The Clerk called the roll.

Present: Aldermen Sysyn, Guinta, Forest, O'Neil

Absent: Alderman Smith

Messrs.: D. Smith, C. Agudelo, T. Lolicata, D. Jerome, D. Aldrich

Chairman Sysyn addressed Item 3 of the agenda:

Ratify and confirm poll conducted November 15, 2005 approving use of parking placards by members of Mayor-Elect Guinta's transition team from November 15, 2005 through January 3, 2006 in the Middle Street Parking Lot and areas immediately adjacent to City Hall.

**A motion is in order to ratify and confirm the poll conducted.**

On motion of Alderman O'Neil, duly seconded by Alderman Forest it was voted to ratify and confirm the poll.

Chairman Sysyn addressed Item 4 of the agenda:

Communication from Elise Ryan, Intown Manchester, requesting free parking in the downtown area after 6 PM on Thursday evenings during the month of December.

Alderman O'Neil moved to approve the request. Alderman Guinta duly seconded the motion. Chairman Sysyn called for a vote. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman Sysyn addressed Item 5 of the agenda:

Communication from David Smith, MTA Executive Director, seeking input regarding where and how a bus transfer point might be located in downtown.

David Smith, MTA Executive Director, stated with me tonight is Evan Roswich who is Operating and Planning Manager and in charge of the project for the MTA that I am about to speak about. On October 18, Tim White of Southern NH Planning sent some information to the Board of Mayor and Aldermen regarding a transit study that Southern NH Planning had undertaken this year. As part of that transit study is what we term as a comprehensive operations analysis of MTA. To go back a little ways this is something that three years ago we attempted to get funded by the state. With the new leadership at the Southern NH Planning Commission we were able this year to secure their cooperation to assist us in performing this study. It is basically a street level view and revision of routes and schedules, which has been needed for some time. As Tim mentioned in his presentation, they have hired a consultant to perform part of that work and make the ultimate recommendations. We have asked the Planning Commission to attempt to identify ways to improve the convenience and service to our passengers through improving times, transfers, etc. Currently, all buses run north or south on Elm Street and the two terminus points are at Veteran's Park northbound and at Elm and Wall Street at Sovereign Bank southbound. Passengers would transfer between buses at any point along Elm Street between those points but transfer is difficult. One of the things that is very common in small city transit systems with the level of service that we have here basically is the frequency of most routes because a timed transfer where a number of buses convene at one time to permit transfers between buses without requiring someone to have to wait for an extended period of time we think would increase ridership. We are asking this evening only to introduce you to the issue and to ask that we begin to work together to identify where that might occur in the downtown area. Currently, our Veteran's Park location can only accommodate a maximum of three buses at one time. In fact it was reduced in length about two years ago when the Visitor's Center opened. We have more room at Elm and Wall Street. I think we can fit five buses there at once but there are 13 bus routes and finding a way to accommodate a larger number than five would be ideal. We have done some preliminary thinking. The consultant has asked us to help him identify locations downtown where a bus meet might be effected and we have begun to look with Tom Lolicata's assistance at a couple of locations. One is the Verizon area. There is no street parking and with permission a number of buses could be there at one time and then disburse. Another suggestion was to look at the Elm Street/Spring Street area as a way of getting a larger number of buses to meet at once. We don't know what the solution is but we would like to at least sensitize you to that issue. At this point we are looking at ways to improve service and convenience for passengers and we think that time transfer is something that will help.

Alderman Forest stated you mentioned that you lost a couple of spots at the Veteran's Block because of the Visitor's Center. I recall and I don't know how that got changed but we okayed two parking spots on Merrimack Street because

there was a conflict with your buses. Why would you have lost two spots because of them?

Mr. Smith responded in fact with the way the buses are combined now and the way they are scheduled now we were able to accommodate the loss of space because at one point in time we only have three buses meeting there. That space was given up because we only had three buses at once. I don't know if any of the members of the Committee might recall but in 1999/2000 there was a recommendation to use both sides of that corner of Merrimack and Elm Street on the Elm Street side to provide space and also on the Merrimack side.

Alderman Forest stated I only recall voting for those two spots when it came before our Committee I believe last year except for the short time when they were using it for the construction. I don't recall voting to allow spots on Elm Street for the Visitor's Center because of the buses. You had testified and I believe Tom Lolicata had testified about the fact that it would interfere with the buses there. I would really like to look into that one.

Mr. Smith responded I think the original request was for more space but we indicated that with the current schedule there are only three buses at that point at one time.

Alderman Forest stated the other question is what are you asking of this Committee. What kind of input do you need or what do you want this Committee to pass on?

Mr. Smith responded I am not asking for a solution tonight but we did want to introduce the issue to you. It is perplexing issue because we know how valuable street parking space is in the downtown area. We are serious also about finding a way to improve the quality of service to our patrons. It is an issue that we hope to find a way to deal with.

Alderman Forest stated you said something about wanting to work with Tom Lolicata. Is that what you are asking our Committee to do is to okay this?

Mr. Smith replied we have already had some discussions with Tom but we would be happy to continue to work with him on this issue.

Alderman O'Neil asked do you know if you went from Central to Merrimack in front of the park how many buses you could get there.

Mr. Smith asked along that whole block. The problem with that is they can't all be going in the same direction. Some are coming from the north.

Alderman O'Neil replied so that will still exist – the north/south has to exist without completely throwing the routes off. So we need to find a place – a block or half a block across from one another that can be utilized?

Mr. Smith responded it would be better on two corners than all in one.

Alderman Lopez stated when you said at the Verizon it would sort of be like you would walk over there and get the bus – would that take away any bus stops along the route.

Mr. Smith responded it would not take away any bus stops along Elm Street. What it would provide is for the convenience of transfers between buses.

Alderman Lopez asked are they capable of synchronizing times to be there for a transfer or is there a lead-time. For example, if I get on a bus and I get there and I have to wait?

Mr. Smith answered currently the problem is that the buses are staggered and we have routes that have running times of 35 to 45 to 50 minutes with an hour frequency so the bus is staggered so it operates most efficiently. The problem with that is it doesn't necessarily lend itself to being convenient for the passenger. For instance, a bus that drives downtown and takes an hour, if you are transferring to a bus that leaves downtown 45 minutes later you are going to wait 45 minutes. What we want to do is find a way to effect a greater number of buses meeting at once so people are not forced to wait long.

Alderman Lopez asked would you anticipate putting up bus shelters at this particular location if you had a lot of buses.

Mr. Smith answered yes. That is one thing that I think we would consider. It may not be something that we could do right away but it is something we would need to get federally funded.

Alderman O'Neil stated I know he is not looking for an exact motion but I think it would be important that we go on record in supporting the study and that all departments necessary, not only Traffic but Public Works, Police and Planning be made available for this. I will make that a motion.

Alderman Forest duly seconded the motion.

Chairman Sysyn called for a vote. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman Sysyn addressed Item 6 of the agenda:

Communication from Carlos Agudelo, NFI Midway Shelter, seeking to obtain reissuance of two residential parking permits for two program vans.

Carlos Agudelo stated the Midway Shelter, I don't know if you are aware, is a 15 bed facility that operates for the Division of Juvenile Services for the State of NH. We provide temporary residential services for 15 boys that are court ordered to a group home. What we provide for them is a safe environment that is substance free while the state decides what the long-term plan is going to be. Typically, a boy won't be there more than 60 days. What we are asking for is to be able to park our program van in front of the shelter. Right now we have to drive them out back and it makes it hard for us to get the boys out the vans. We do a lot of community based activities and take them out to community events and sometimes we have to drive them to court. It would just be convenient for the program to be able to have the parking permits.

Alderman O'Neil asked where is 136. What block is that between?

Mr. Agudelo answered it is between Pine and Union Street. We are the third house on the left.

Alderman O'Neil asked so across from St. Joe's.

Mr. Agudelo answered yes.

Alderman O'Neil stated I have to be honest. This, in my opinion, is not in the spirit of the residential parking permit. It is not what it was intended to do and you do have on-site parking. That is what the spirit of the residential parking program was intended to do in my opinion. How many spaces do you have on-site?

Mr. Agudelo responded we have about 10 spaces on-site but those are taken by the staff members and that is where the problem is. We have limited staff members.

Alderman O'Neil stated this could open up a door for us if we did this for your agency all over downtown Manchester. I have a real concern with that.

Alderman Forest stated this is a suggestion going along with what Alderman O'Neil was saying but you may have to have some staff members get some parking at the Hartnett Lot. They might have to walk up the lot a little bit but that would free up the two spaces you need.

Alderman Forest moved to receive and file. Alderman O'Neil duly seconded the motion. Chairman Sysyn called for a vote. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Alderman O'Neil asked, Tom, do we have permits available in the Hartnett Lot. Can he speak with your department about getting a couple of permits?

Thomas Lolicata, Traffic Director, answered yes.

Chairman Sysyn advised that the Traffic Department has submitted an agenda, which needs to be addressed as follows:

**STOP SIGNS:**

On Chestnut Street at Trenton Street, NWC, SEC (4-Way School Zone Emergency Act)

Alderman Roy

On Belmont Street at Dix Street, NWC, SEC (Emergency Act)

Alderman Shea

On Sullivan Street at Parkside Avenue, NEC, SWC (3-Way Stop School Zone)

Alderman Thibault

On Summer Street at Belmont Street, NEC, SWC

On Hosley Street at Summer Street, SEC

On Hosley Street at Grove Street, NWC

Alderman Osborne

**STOP SIGN (BACK-UP):**

On Central Street at Wilson Street, NWC

Alderman Osborne

**NO PARKING:**

On Trenton Street, south side, from No. Bay Street to a point 90 feet east  
(Emergency Act)

On Trenton Street, south side, from No. Bay Street to a point 70 feet west  
(Emergency Act)

Alderman Roy

On Valley Street, north side, from Cypress Street to a point 60 feet west

Alderman Osborne

On Jackson Street, south side, from a point 130 feet east of Mast Road to a point

75 feet easterly  
On McQuesten Street, north side, from a point 105 feet east of Second Street to  
Hill Street  
Alderman Smith

**RESCIND NO PARKING:**

On Villa Street, south side, from a point 85 feet east of Belmont Street to a point  
35 feet east  
Alderman Shea

On McQuesten Street, north side, from Second Street to Hill Street (ORD. 7234)  
Alderman Smith

**RESCIND NO PARKING (LOADING ZONE):**

On Mammoth Road, east side, from a point 1800 feet south of Bridge Street to a  
point 40 feet south (ORD. 7712)  
Alderman Sysyn

Deputy City Clerk Johnson noted that there are three additions to stop signs  
submitted by Alderman Osborne at Summer and Hosley Streets.

Alderman Forest moved to approve the traffic agenda as amended. Alderman  
O'Neil duly seconded the motion. Chairman Sysyn called for a motion. There  
being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman Sysyn addressed Item 8 of the agenda:

Discussion relative to usage of Arms Park by the National Multiple  
Sclerosis Society.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated they are requesting the use of Arms Park for a  
start and finish.

Alderman O'Neil moved to approve the request. Alderman Forest duly seconded  
the motion. Chairman Sysyn called for a vote. There being none opposed, the  
motion carried.

Chairman Sysyn addressed Item 9 of the agenda:

Discussion relative to the Victory Parking Garage Facility.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated we did have an additional handout that was  
distributed.

Chairman Sysyn stated at the last meeting we had people in regarding the Victory Parking Garage Facility and they have put out their punchlist with all of their figures and I will ask the gentlemen from Victory to please come forward and identify themselves.

Alderman O'Neil stated I spoke to Deputy Simmons today and Lt. Valenti may be able to correct me if I am wrong but we did ask about requiring a police detail at the garage and I think that for a majority of the available times there has been a police officer there if there is a police officer available. Is that your understanding as well? Secondly, do we know anything about the claims that we talked about? Did we get any report on that or maybe these gentlemen have it? David did you get involved with the claims at all with Harry Ntapalis' office? We probably need to follow-up on that. Tom were you involved with any claims since the last meeting?

Alderman Forest stated I think we recommended that you go to Harry.

David Jerome stated I am manager of the Victory Garage.

Dave Aldrich stated I am from National Garages.

Chairman Sysyn stated we had asked for a punchlist and what they needed for funds. They were never funded and they are short of funds for the upkeep of the garage.

Alderman Forest stated at our last meeting when they were here and we asked for this list we did recommend that you do the list and get it to Harry Ntapalis or Tom Lolicata. Was that done at all?

Mr. Jerome responded no I haven't spoken with Harry yet. This is just information and things that I have seen that need repair.

Alderman O'Neil stated I think we kind of broke this into two different areas – regular operating repairs and then repairs done through damage. Can you just walk us through the cover sheet? I think the rest of it is supporting the cover sheet. Is that correct?

Mr. Jerome answered yes. The pages are numbered so hopefully it is easy enough to follow. We talked about new door closers at the top of the list. Most of them are functioning at the moment. The hydraulics in a lot of those closers are starting to leak and in speaking with the lock people they will go at some point so I am looking at five to be replaced. Again, the price is \$745. Page 5 has that particular



quote. Doors and door frames. There are a few door frames in the facility that need attention and have really started to rust and swell causing problems with keeping the doors locked if the facility is locked at night and operation of the doors themselves. Again, that is also on Page 1 and 2. That total of \$5,781 is an estimate. That is not just for one door. That is for a few doors. The breakdown is also on those pages. Again, door locks the same thing. Windows. I still have two that need replacing. We did just replace one in the elevator shaft on the third level on Amherst and Vine Street. That had been damaged. That has been replaced.

Alderman O'Neil asked is that the one that was damaged from the gunshots.

Mr. Jerome answered correct. We also have two other windows that need replacing. They are not a safety hazard, they are just cracked and they will need replacing at some point. The estimate is right there by the same company that came and replaced the elevator shaft windows. The booth window. I had ordered it. It has actually been repaired and replace for \$80. There was a crack in the first booth window. Electrical repairs. We have some issues in the office with some outlets. I had someone come in and take a look at that. One of the computers in the office is not functioning and hasn't functioned for some time now. Also, the second booth is functioning right now but has been damaged by vandals kicking in the faceplate. It is in rough shape so I had them look at that and that is also in that quote that is on Page 3. The same with the lights on the third floor. We fixed those. That was just a matter of changing out the fixture. Amherst and Chestnut – that is a solar cell that is missing in the light and they are coming to replace that. Once again, the heater and the A/C for the booth and the office. On the cover sheet I also stated that I spoke with Stanley Elevator concerning some of the issues with the elevator. Of main concern to me was the Concord and Vine Street elevator. That elevator was called in to have the doors fixed. Periodically they lock up and occasionally the elevator will move with the door still opened about six inches. Of course, that is cause for concern. I have spoken with them and in looking at the elevators they do need attention and at some point that particular elevator, even though it is safe, will be shut down if it is not repaired and they can no longer get those doors closed. Of course, the building itself. Several areas of the building have breakage and there is some falling of concrete taking place. Over time that happened. I have gone through the facility with Shawn Games from Coil Tanner and there is a letter attached. Some of the work they are looking to do...the letter should be towards the back. Basically he is just letting us know the figure for some of the repairs. They are talking about doing it in 2006 and they are currently working with the City with CIP funding for some other repairs.

Alderman Forest asked on the elevator do you have a standard maintenance contract with Stanley Elevator or is the only time you call them when it breaks down.

Mr. Jerome answered I have a maintenance contract with them but they come in once a month to check it out and make sure everything is working. They note any damages and they will replace anything that is damaged and fix it within the contract. Then, of course, if I have to call them in. On regular time they will come in of course.

Alderman O'Neil asked regarding the elevator it is just their age. They haven't had a lot of money put into them over the years so at some point we are going to have to do some major repairs to them?

Mr. Jerome answered that is my understanding.

Alderman O'Neil asked do you have an estimate from Stanley Elevator.

Mr. Jerome answered yes I do. It is on the handout.

Alderman O'Neil asked that is \$49,600.

Mr. Jerome answered yes. That is for both elevators and it does list the things that they will furnish, install and warranty.

Alderman O'Neil asked and it should correct some of the items that they are currently...for instance you said the elevator moves when the doors aren't completely closed.

Mr. Jerome answered correct. They will update that. Some of the problems that we have with those elevators from what I understand and in my discussion with the technicians from Stanley is that those pipes aren't really made for the outdoor environment and they are oil elevators so in the winter especially we have problems. We have a heat lamp on them to keep them warm and that should be fixed when they do these changes so that may address some of the issues we are facing now.

Alderman O'Neil asked so the two larger items...Tommy you did say at the last meeting that we have a reserve fund in place. Can we get Mr. Lolicata to come up?

Thomas Lolicata, Traffic Director, stated I believe you are talking about the Parking Facilities Fund, which they are now well aware of. That is run through the Highway Department and Mr. Thomas. They have Coil Tanner also speaking with these gentlemen as well as Mr. Thomas about where to put some of the money. We can probably change some priorities depending on what happens here.

You are not going to get that from negotiations. I think CIP money has to take care of some of this. He is aware of it, Alderman.

Alderman O'Neil asked so the two bottom projects, the elevators and what is referred to as the building, those could be referred to the 2006 CIP budget.

Mr. Lolicata answered or the Parking Facilities Fund. We have money in there and it is just a matter of priorities – parking lots, garages, etc.

Alderman O'Neil asked am I correct in my quick math, Mr. Jerome that it is approximately \$8,000 for the repairs you referenced above.

Mr. Jerome answered yes that is a ballpark.

Alderman O'Neil asked, Tom, can we take \$8,000 out of the Parking Facilities Fund to do those repairs.

Mr. Lolicata answered we will have to take a look at that. We can do a lot of things but I am not sure how the priorities are. We are looking at parking lots and other things.

Alderman O'Neil asked but if we determine that this is a priority can we take the \$8,000. It is not a lot of money and if it gets these items fixed...

Mr. Lolicata interjected we can probably do that, yes.

Alderman O'Neil stated I think we reviewed this at the last meeting. There isn't any money in their operating budget to do it so I don't know where else we would get it.

Mr. Lolicata responded that is the place to go.

Alderman O'Neil moved to take \$8,000 out of the Parking Facilities Fund to allow the items that have been identified as maintenance punchlist items to get repaired and that we refer the larger items of the elevator repair and building repairs to the 2007 CIP budget.

Alderman O'Neil asked is there any danger with the elevator in referring it to next year's budget.

Mr. Jerome answered no I don't think so. They didn't indicate there was any danger.

Alderman O'Neil asked and on the structure itself, those repairs.

Mr. Jerome answered no. Some of the things right now we are calling them in for, particularly with that one elevator.

Alderman Forest duly seconded the motion. Chairman Sysyn called for a vote. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Alderman O'Neil asked do you know how much money is in the Parking Facilities Fund, Tom.

Mr. Lolicata answered no I don't. I can get you a figure by the end of the week.

Alderman Forest stated Alderman O'Neil's motion doesn't cover the vandalism part. Again, I think we made a suggestion at the last meeting so why don't I make a motion again that whatever the vandalism part of it is, Tom and David and National Garages get together with Harry Ntapalis with the estimates.

Mr. Lolicata responded every time there is vandalism he is instructed to go right to Harry Ntapalis.

Alderman Forest replied absolutely.

Alderman O'Neil asked what is the motion again.

Alderman Forest stated the motion is to have David and Tom submit the vandalism charges to Harry Ntapalis and work with him and let him decide if it is covered by Risk Management.

Alderman O'Neil duly seconded the motion. Chairman Sysyn called for a vote. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Alderman O'Neil asked does this take care of everything that is outstanding – either general maintenance or vandalism items that you are aware of today.

Mr. Jerome answered for vandalism and general maintenance, as far as I can tell.

Alderman O'Neil stated at one point I know they kicked the gate in and that was repaired. Many of the vandalism items have been corrected.

Mr. Jerome responded right to the best of my knowledge.

Alderman O'Neil asked do you see and I know you are not there when the police officer is there on Thursday, Friday and Saturday nights but have you seen any change around the garage, is it either cleaner or less...

Mr. Jerome interjected generally Mondays are our worst days as far as the trash for the facility and we have noticed an improvement in that condition. Obviously something is happening.

Alderman O'Neil asked so it appears to be working. Since the police officer has been there have we had any major vandalism item?

Mr. Jerome answered nothing major. Skidmarking a little bit and that is going to happen I guess.

Alderman O'Neil asked but no damage to windows, equipment, etc.

Mr. Jerome answered not as of yet.

Alderman Gatsas asked did those two motions include the pay raises that are on Item 9 on our agenda.

Chairman Sysyn answered no. We haven't discussed that yet.

Alderman Lopez stated I have one question. What is the turnaround time or policy that is in effect if something happens over there? How do you report something to the Risk Manager or to the Traffic Director?

Mr. Jerome answered basically what happens is I will take note of whatever it is, call the Police if necessary and then I get in touch with Mr. Lolicata and explain to him the damage.

Alderman Lopez asked is it verbal or is in writing.

Mr. Jerome answered usually what I will do is actually stop by his office to discuss the problem and get feedback on how to best handle it.

Alderman Lopez stated I would suggest that you start putting things in writing and not wait until the last minute to come in with this stuff.

Alderman O'Neil responded well this isn't the last minute. This was brought up at the Traffic Committee meeting. If I may, Madame Chair, one of the other things that came out of our meeting a month ago was to make sure that if there is an incident regarding vandalism that a police report does, in fact, get done so you

need to make sure you contact Lt. Valenti and Tom to make sure that the police report gets done on anything and everything that happens there. I think we all agree that maybe that wasn't happening in the past so hopefully going forward that does happen. I think you can talk to Lt. Valenti about the procedure. I don't know that everything has to go to you, per say, but they need to have a police officer come and take a report.

Chairman Sysyn asked do we want to discuss the pay raises.

Alderman O'Neil stated it has been customary and maybe Dave Aldridge can help me through this but it has been customary in the past with these employees to give them adjustments in their pay around the same time that City employees were given adjustments in their pay as well. I don't think it has been to the extent of the City employees but there has been some adjustment. David, when was the last time they were given an adjustment to their pay?

Mr. Aldridge responded the last time they received an adjustment was July 2004.

Chairman Sysyn stated and the garage is making money so I don't know why they wouldn't get a raise.

Alderman O'Neil asked but that is something that you would have to take out of the operating budget correct. I think it should be done. It has happened done there in the past. It is a minimal amount of money for the limited employees that work there.

Alderman O'Neil moved that the adjustments as are presented in the package, approximately \$4,300, be approved.

Alderman Forest duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Gatsas stated I have a few questions regarding this. Didn't we, as a Board, ask for a new contract to come forward sometime in December? That is my first question. My second question is are these City employees or are they somebody else's employees?

Mr. Aldridge responded they are directly employed by Central Parking but in turn, the City of Manchester reimburses us for any expenses related to payroll.

Alderman Gatsas asked do these employees get benefits.

Mr. Aldridge answered yes they do.

Alderman Gatsas asked so the benefits piece is over and above this.

Mr. Aldridge answered the benefits weren't affected by the pay raise analysis. They are included, for instance, if they have health insurance, 401K, etc., those things are not included in this analysis but they generally are paid that.

Alderman Gatsas asked are they included in your operating budget.

Mr. Aldridge answered in the operating budget actually the manpower line item is comprehensive of a few different line items but it is over and above the payroll allotment if that is the question.

Alderman Gatsas responded no. My question is, is the City paying for their benefits.

Mr. Aldridge replied yes they are.

Alderman Gatsas asked if they are not City employees why are we even talking about raises. I think it is inappropriate for the City to be weighing in on a private enterprise and the amount of money that they pay employees.

Mr. Aldridge answered the reason it is being brought to you is because even though they are directly employees of ours, you indirectly pay for it so, therefore, we would want your approval before we make the submission.

Alderman Gatsas asked if we are directing wages I think that somebody could probably tell us from Risk or Human Resources that if we are directing these we could have a direct allegiance to those employees and I certainly wouldn't want to sit here for one second and have the City be obligated for raises for employees that aren't ours.

Mr. Aldridge responded I understand what you are saying but they are directly employees of National Garages/Central Parking. We in turn would give the raises, but again because it exceeds what we have for a payroll line item we would want to know that the City approves of the said raises even though they are responsible to us and to us only. All we are doing is seeking your approval to give those raises.

Alderman Gatsas asked the last contract has it been signed by both parties.

Mr. Aldridge answered yes.

Alderman Gatsas asked and what is the termination date.

Mr. Lolicata answered the extension has been signed up through December of this year.

Alderman Gatsas asked is that your understanding also, Mr. Aldridge.

Mr. Aldridge answered yes that is my understanding.

Alderman Gatsas asked so why are we giving out raises. When do they go into effect? If we have a new contract coming forward why are we...

Mr. Aldridge answered let's say you went with another parking operator for the sake of argument. You are not bound...these employees are only employees of Central up until the day we leave. At that point in time either the new operator would come in and take over the employees if they so chose and they would hire them and interview them at the rates that they decide.

Alderman O'Neil asked and currently to the best of my knowledge we have no RFP on the street for a new operator. We were waiting for the results from the parking study, which is only in draft form. It will probably be several months before we see it in final form.

Chairman Sysyn stated the package came out today.

Alderman O'Neil asked in draft form or final form.

Chairman Sysyn answered draft form.

Alderman O'Neil stated I think that is one of the reasons why we extended the contract again to see where we go with parking. It has been the history that the budget has included adjustments for these employees and it has been an expense to the City correct as everything else is. We pay the expenses on them being there.

Mr. Aldridge responded correct. All expenses are paid for by the City of Manchester.

Alderman O'Neil stated unfortunately this year with the cost of utilities, etc., the budget is a little out of whack. There isn't much we can do but we do believe there is enough money to cover this correct?

Mr. Aldridge responded yes and that is why we are seeking your approval. I can show you where in different areas the line items don't match but it is definitely something that we would seek your approval on.



Alderman Gatsas asked can we get a copy of that budget as a full Board.

Mr. Aldridge answered I can definitely get you a copy of the budget.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson asked can you provide it to the Clerk's Office and we will distribute it to the Aldermen.

Chairman Sysyn called for a vote on the motion to approve \$4,300 for pay raises for the employees of the Victory Street Garage. The motion carried with Alderman Guinta being duly recorded in opposition.

### **NEW BUSINESS**

Chairman Sysyn stated Stephanie Lewry is here from Intown Manchester and she wanted to put up a banner on Hanover Street and she was directed to the Traffic Department. She wants to put up a lit up banner on Hanover Street but she needs to come to this Committee to do this.

Alderman O'Neil stated I thought there was a policy about banners. I know that other organizations have been turned down. Tom, is that correct?

Mr. Lolicata responded the last I heard was that we stopped it. After talking with Harry Ntapalis going back a few years unless the poles are made according to standards for the type of banner you want to hang they haven't gone along with it because it is a liability. In other words, if somebody is going to put up a banner, those poles should be made just for that or at least have the strength to hold that particular banner up. Down on Hanover Street they don't have the strength to hold them.

Alderman O'Neil stated banners that have gotten put up have been put up without the approval of the City.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated I would just note that the Board did ban the banners other than in Veteran's Park. That is the only location that has been approved. It is actually a Committee on Administration approval, not Traffic. The poles on Hanover Street that exist now do not hold the banners and, therefore, they haven't been approved for that reason and the Board did ban them. There was a physical action by the Board.

Stephanie Lewry, Intown Manchester, stated I am not requesting that the banner be placed on the poles. Actually my project is a CIP funded project, which is coming to fruition this month. I can show you a photograph of what it is that we

are getting ready to accomplish. The sheets that are being passed around are photographs of banners similar to what we are going to put up in Manchester or what we would like to put up in Manchester. They attached to buildings, not to light poles. I saw this project in Boston. One of them is at Downtown Crossing in Boston and some of the other examples are in Cambridge or in other cities in Massachusetts where the artist has woven twinkly Christmas lights into a fishnet and at night it looks like these lights are just floating in the air. It was an interesting project and I proposed it for a CIP project and was given the funding to do a model project this year. This project will be installed on Hanover Street with the permission of the building owners – one at 889 Elm Street, which happens to be the building that my office is in and the Chamber of Commerce and across the street would be the Citizen's Bank building. I have contacted both of these building owners for permission to install the banner, which would be an eyehook into the building. With the permission of the Traffic Committee to put this banner up, the banner will be installed on the buildings, not the light poles.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated I would just note that if they are placing it on the buildings that perhaps the Building Department needs to review it for permits or ordinance.

Chairman Sysyn stated my question would be if CIP approved this project why are we...

Deputy City Clerk Johnson interjected I am not creating a hassle. I am just stating that there may be an ordinance that either prohibits it or needs to be changed to accommodate it or there may be a permitting process required.

Alderman O'Neil asked Stephanie will this banner go across the street.

Ms. Lewry answered yes.

Alderman Forest stated I have been advised that maybe what we can do is...CIP may have granted the funds or whatever for this banner but I think because it is being attached to a building I would like to move to refer Stephanie to Leon LaFreniere at the Building Department for the proper permits and give him the authority to say yes or no because it is really a...it is going to be attached to buildings anyway so it is a building code thing and not really something that needs permission from the Traffic Department.

Chairman Sysyn stated they would still have to have the insurance.

Alderman Forest responded that is why I would refer her to the Building Department for the proper permits or the okay to put it up.

Alderman Guinta asked what is your timeline that you need some sort of approval from whichever Committee it is that we figure out.

Ms. Lewry answered I would like to get the banners up in December so that we can begin to enjoy them during the holidays, however, the banners are not intended to be just holiday banners. They are actually a project called “winter lights” so these banners would be up in the dark hours of the winter and then they would come down probably in late February. They are reusable so they would be installed again when it starts to get dark out early.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated we have an answer for you. I think that in order to proceed with it you would need a motion to approve the air rights subject to meeting the requirements of the Building Department and that can be reported out to the Board at the December 6 meeting for approval.

Alderman Guinta asked and this Committee has the authority to do that as opposed to...

Deputy City Clerk Johnson interjected it would still have to go to the Board.

Alderman Guinta moved to recommend approval of the air rights subject to meeting the Building Department’s conditions. We will bring that to the Board on December 6 and she can work with the Building Department in the interim.

Alderman Forest duly seconded the motion.

Alderman O’Neil asked so this is an air rights issue, not a banner issue. This is similar to the air rights for instance that we granted Catholic Medical Center for their...it just has to meet all of those requirements?

Deputy City Clerk Johnson answered because you are attaching it to the buildings and you are not necessarily doing it strictly in the right-of-way I would assume it would meet the conditions.

Alderman Forest asked can we recommend or put a little notation on there to the Building Department asking if we can expedite it because it is for the holidays.

Chairman Sysyn called for a vote on the motion to recommend approval of the air rights to hang a banner across Hanover Street subject to meeting the Building Department’s conditions. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated for the record I would just note that we will ask Building to make sure that Traffic and Highway are okay with this also.

### **TABLED ITEMS**

**A motion is in order to remove any of the following items from the table for discussion.**

10. Communication from Alderman O'Neil relative to installation of traffic signs in residential neighborhoods.

On motion of Alderman O'Neil, duly seconded by Alderman Forest it was voted to remove this item from the agenda.

On motion of Alderman O'Neil, duly seconded by Alderman Forest it was voted to refer this item to the Mayor-elect's office to come up with a policy.

11. Communication from Cathy Champagne, President of Jutras Signs and Flags, requesting the Board's consideration and approval of the proposed "Manchester Gateway Arch Project" which will span over Elm Street with an electronic message center sign component to display advertising as well as messages of community interest.  
*(Tabled 09/13/2005 – pending Highway, Traffic and Planning Departments work with Jutras Signs to find another suitable location. Additional communications from Jutras Signs requesting the proposal not be denied until given full consideration.)*

On motion of Alderman Forest, duly seconded by Alderman O'Neil it was voted to remove this item from the table.

Alderman Forest moved to receive and file. Alderman O'Neil duly seconded the motion.

Alderman O'Neil asked wasn't one of the reasons it was tabled to find an alternative location for it. Have we received any correspondence regarding an alternative location?

Chairman Sysyn answered no. They want what they want.

Alderman O'Neil asked they want Elm Street or nothing.

Chairman Sysyn answered according to the most recent correspondence.

Alderman O'Neil stated I thought maybe they were looking at a side street or something at this point.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated receiving and filing won't prohibit them from coming back with a different location.

Chairman Sysyn called for a vote on the motion to receive and file. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

12. Communication from Martha Cossey and Trish Norton requesting the issuance of two (2) parking permits for the Middle Street parking lot.  
*(Tabled 10/11/2005 pending Parking Study report.)*

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated you can either leave this on the table for the next Committee or you can receive and file it and allow them to come back at a later date after the parking study has been looked into but I think it will be some time before that is done.

Alderman O'Neil asked so what is your suggestion.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson answered there are two options. One is to just leave it on the table for the next Committee on Traffic and the other would be to receive and file it and we can send them a letter suggesting that they request these at a later date when the parking study has been reviewed.

Alderman O'Neil asked do we know if the parking consultant has looked at this permitting in this particular lot.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson answered I have had no discussion at all with the parking consultant.

On motion of Alderman O'Neil, duly seconded by Alderman Guinta it was voted to remove this item from the table.

On motion of Alderman O'Neil, duly seconded by Alderman Guinta it was voted to refer this request to the parking consultant for consideration.

There being no further business, on motion of Alderman O'Neil, duly seconded by Alderman Forest it was voted to adjourn.

A True Record. Attest.

Clerk of Committee